

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 17-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 17 and 19 are independent claims.

Title of the Invention

The title of the Invention was objected to as being not descriptive. Accordingly, a new Title of the Invention, "REMUTIPLEXING APPARATUS AND METHOD BASED ON REALLOCATED DECODING TIME", has been submitted.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 17 - 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuri et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,006) (hereinafter "Matsuri"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Initially, Applicants submit that the Matsuri does not teach or reasonably suggest the features of, "the media time bases of all the media information are set equal to a media time base of a desired media information", and "the decoding time is reallocated", as recited in independent claims 17 and 19. Examiner refers to column 5, lines 9-13, and column 8, lines 36-54, respectively as allegedly disclosing the "media time bases setting" and "decoding time reallocating" features as claimed. Applicants respectfully submit that the passages referred to by the Examiner merely sets the elementary streams of a program to the same "system clock

reference”, not a “media time base of a desired media information”, which is not a fixed system clock but is selectable. Furthermore, Matsuri merely discloses that the system clock time can be adjusted by varying the frequency of the clock pulse generator (column 8, lines 36-54). Nowhere does Matsuri teach or suggest that the multiplexing apparatus comprises “*a clock information reallocating section for reallocating the decoding time*” to the selected media streams based on the remultiplexed value, as claimed in claims 17 and 19 respectively. As shown in Fig. 10, and discussed on page 46 of the present application, by reallocating the decoding time of a media stream and remultiplexing the media stream containing the decoding time information, it is possible to transmit a media stream containing accurate decoding time information.

Applicants believe independent claims 17 and 19 define subject matter that is not taught or reasonably suggested by the Matsuri reference. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) should be withdrawn, and these claims should be allowed.

Dependent claims 18 and 20 further define additional features into independent claims 17 and 19 respectively. These claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claims for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 17-20 have been amended to clarify some of the functional language as originally claimed. Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced to the Specification. Support of these amendments can be found throughout the Specification and the drawings.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks and amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

However, should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' representative, Michael K. Mutter (Reg. No. 29,680) at the telephone number of the undersigned in order to discuss the application and expedite prosecution.

Dated: November 30, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: